arXiv:cond-mat/0304698v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 30 Apr 2003

Supersymmetric quenched complexity in the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model

Alessia Annibale, Andrea Cavagna, Irene Giardina, Giorgio Parisi
Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma "La Sapienza" and
Center for Statistical Mechanics and Complexity, INFM Roma 1,
Piazzale Aldo Moro 2, 00185 Roma, Italy

(Dated: February 2, 2008)

By using the BRST supersymmetry we compute the quenched complexity of the TAP states in the SK model. We prove that the BRST complexity is equal to the Legendre transform of the static free energy with respect to the largest replica symmetry breaking point of its overlap matrix.

A key issue in the physics of complex systems is the computation of the entropy of the metastable states, normally called complexity in spin-glasses, and configurational entropy in structural glasses and supercooled liquids. A knowledge of the complexity is crucial for understanding the dynamics of a system when this is heavily influenced by strong metastability effects. Moreover, in some theoretical frameworks, the drop in the number of accessible states leads to an ergodicity breaking transition. In this context the complexity is essential also from the thermodynamic point of view, as in the Adam-Gibbs theory of the thermodynamic glass transition [1].

Despite its enormous theoretical relevance, there are few analytic calculations of the complexity in glassy systems, and this for a very good reason. In a nutshell, to find the complexity we have to compute the number of local minima (metastable states) of some state function, which is typically highly nontrivial. Just to fix ideas, we may think that this function is the Hamiltonian H. To compute the complexity, we must impose that the gradient of H (the force) vanishes in the local minima, and we have to include as a normalization factor the second derivative of H (the Hessian). Moreover, we may want to classify the metastable states according to the value of H, that is to their height in the landscape. Therefore, beside the force and the Hessian, we must include the state function itself in the calculation. Computing the complexity is thus a formidable technical task, since we have to deal with *three* very complicated functions: H, ∂H, and $\partial^2 H$. In comparison, the calculation of the partition function, which just involves H, is an easy business.

This apparent difficulty in the calculation of the complexity stems from the fact that most methods treat $H, \partial H$ and $\partial^2 H$ as three independent objects, when of course they are not. Every calculation which fails to capture the fact that it is essentially just *one* function, H, that we are dealing with, effectively wastes a crucial information. It would be therefore important to find a tool which exploits this information to simplify the calculation of the complexity. The Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin (BRST) supersymmetry [2, 3] seems to be such a tool. As it was first noted in [4] for a particular model, a BRST calculation of the complexity is in fact equivalent to the one of the partition function. This is indeed what we expect from a method which does *not* treat $H, \partial H$ and $\partial^2 H$ as independent functions.

The formal equivalence between complexity and standard thermodynamics found in [4] by means of the BRST supersymmetry is a very important theoretical issue. In the context of spin-glasses the existence of such a connection has been much investigated in the past [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13]. In a classic paper [5], Bray and Moore first calculated the complexity of the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick (SK) model [14] by counting the number of local minima of the Thouless-Anderson-Palmer (TAP) free energy [15], which in mean-field spin-glasses is the state function discussed above. The same authors also noted in [6] some deep formal connections between TAP complexity and standard thermodynamics, while De Dominicis and Young showed in [8] that TAP and static approaches were in fact equivalent, once some key hypothesis were made. These studies culminated in a remarkable work [9], where Bray, Moore and Young uncovered a sort of Legendre transform relationship between TAP complexity and static free energy.

A method to compute the complexity which does not rely on the existence of a TAP free energy, was introduced by Monasson [10], and by Franz and Parisi [11]. The basic idea is to introduce a coupling between different systems forcing them to live in the same metastable state. The free energy cost of such a constrained super-system is equal to the entropic contribution of the metastable states, that is the complexity. Within this approach, close connections between complexity and thermodynamics, similar to those found in the TAP context in [9], were found. In particular, in spin-glass models with one step of replica symmetry breaking [16, 17], the formulation of Monasson shows that the complexity is equal to the Legendre transform of the static free energy with respect to the breaking point x of the overlap matrix [10, 13].

Despite all these investigations, it is fair to say that a general formal connection between complexity of the metastable states and static free energy, has not been proved yet. In particular, it is unclear how the Legendre transform method of [10] should be used in systems with more than one step of replica symmetry breaking, as the SK model. In fact, none of the previous SK investigations [6, 9] succeeded in proving the existence of a sharp Legendre transform relationship as in one-RSB systems.

In this Letter we find for the first time an exact connection between complexity of the metastable states and static free energy in the SK model: we prove that the quenched TAP complexity obtained by means of the BRST supersymmetry is the Legendre transform of the static free energy with respect to the *largest* breaking point of its overlap matrix. Our result confirms the validity of the Legendre transform method of [10, 11, 12], and its consistency with the investigations of [6, 7, 8, 9]. Moreover, our findings strongly suggest that the BRST supersymmetry should be considered as an essential tool for the computation of the complexity in more general glassy systems.

The complexity of the TAP states with free energy density f, at inverse temperature β, is defined as [5],

$$\Sigma(\beta,f)=\frac{1}{N}\log\sum_{\alpha=1}^{\mathcal{N}}\delta\left[N\beta f-\beta F_{TAP}(m^\alpha)\right]=\frac{1}{N}\log\int dr\; e^{Nr\beta f}\;\sum_{\alpha=1}^{\mathcal{N}}e^{-r\beta F_{TAP}(m^\alpha)}\;, \tag{1}$$

where $m^\alpha\equiv\{m_i^\alpha\}$, are the local magnetizations at site $i=1\dots N$, in state $\alpha=1\dots\mathcal{N}$. A state m^α is defined as a local minimum of the TAP free energy $F_{TAP}(m)$ [15]. If we define the thermodynamic potential $\Psi(\beta,r)$,

$$\exp\left(-\beta Nr\,\Psi\right)\equiv\sum_{\alpha=1}^{\mathcal{N}}e^{-r\beta F_{TAP}(m^\alpha)}\;, \tag{2}$$

we can use the steepest descent method in (1), and obtain the complexity as the Legendre transform of $\Psi(\beta,r)$,

$$\Sigma(\beta,f)=\beta rf-\beta r\,\Psi(\beta,r)\;, \tag{3}$$

where the parameter $r=r(\beta,f)$ is fixed by the equation,

$$\Psi(\beta,r)+r\,\frac{\partial\Psi(\beta,r)}{\partial r}=f\;. \tag{4}$$

From (2) we see that for $r=1$ the potential Ψ must be equal to the standard static free energy of the system $F(\beta)$, calculated in the TAP context. This calculation was first performed in [8], where it was shown that the relation $\Psi(\beta,r=1)=F(\beta)$ only held if some suitable assumptions were made. In [18] it was proved that the assumptions used in [8] were in fact a general consequence of the BRST supersymmetry. However, the situation was less clear for generic values of r, since the calculations of [7, 9] for $r\neq1$ seemed to explicitly break the BRST invariance [19]. In what follows we perform a supersymmetric quenched calculation of $\Psi(\beta,r)$, and prove that this potential is intimately related to the static free energy $F(\beta)$ even for $r\neq1$. The TAP free energy for the SK model is given by [15],

$$\beta F_{TAP}(m)=-\frac{\beta}{2}\sum_{ij}J_{ij}m_im_j+\frac{1}{\beta}\sum_i\phi_0(m_i)\;, \tag{5}$$

with,

$$\phi_0(m)=\frac{1}{2}\log(1-m^2)+m\,\tanh^{-1}(m)-\log 2-\frac{\beta^2}{4}(1-q)^2\;. \tag{6}$$

The variable q is the self-overlap of the TAP states, $q=\frac{1}{N}\sum_i m_i^2$. The quenched couplings J are random variables with Gaussian distribution and variance N. From (2) we have that the *quenched* potential $\Psi(\beta,r)$ is,

$$-\beta r\,\Psi(\beta,r)=\frac{1}{nN}\log\overline{\rho(\beta,r|J)^n}\;, \tag{7}$$

with,

$$\rho(\beta,r|J)=\sum_{\alpha=1}^{\mathcal{N}}e^{-r\beta F_{TAP}(m^\alpha)}=\int\prod_i dm_i\;\delta(\partial_iF_{TAP}(m))\;|\det(\partial_i\partial_jF_{TAP}(m))|\;e^{-\beta r\,F_{TAP}(m)}\;. \tag{8}$$

In (7) we have $N\to\infty$ and $n\to0$, and the over-bar indicates an average over the disorder. As usual, the modulus of the determinant will be dropped. This amounts to assume that at sufficiently low temperatures the largest part of TAP solutions are minima [18]. Of course, any method which drops the modulus is doomed to fail if stable minima are subdominant with respect to unstable saddles. After introducing the commuting fields x_i to implement the delta functions, and the anti-commuting (Grassmann) fields $\bar{\psi}_i, \psi_i$ for the determinant, we find,

$$\rho(\beta, r|J) = \int \mathcal{D}m\, \mathcal{D}x\, \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi}\, \mathcal{D}\psi \quad e^{\beta S(m,x,\bar{\psi},\psi)} \ , \tag{9}$$

where the action S is given by,

$$S(m, x, \bar{\psi}, \psi) = \sum_i x_i \partial_i F_{TAP}(m) + \sum_{ij} \bar{\psi}_i \psi_j \partial_i \partial_j F_{TAP}(m) - r F_{TAP}(m) \ . \tag{10}$$

By averaging $\rho(\beta, r|J)^n$ over the disorder we obtain the following effective action,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta S \ =& \ \frac{\beta^2}{2N}\left[\sum_{ab}^{n}\left(\sum_{i}^{N} x_i^a x_i^b\right)\left(\sum_{j}^{N} m_j^a m_j^b\right) + \sum_{ab}^{n}\left(\sum_{i}^{N} x_i^a m_i^b\right)^2 - \sum_{ab}^{n}\left(\sum_{i}^{N} \bar{\psi}_i^a \psi_i^b\right)^2\right] \\ &+ \ \frac{\beta^2}{2N}\left[\frac{r^2}{2}\sum_{ab}^{n}\left(\sum_{i}^{N} m_i^a m_i^b\right)^2 - 2r\sum_{ab}^{n}\left(\sum_{i}^{N} m_i^a x_i^b\right)\left(\sum_{j}^{N} m_j^a m_j^b\right)\right] \\ &+ \ \sum_{a}^{n}\sum_{i}^{N}\left[x_i^a \phi_1(m_i^a) + \bar{\psi}_i^a \psi_i^b \phi_2(m_i^a) - r\phi_0(m_i^a)\right] \ , \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $\phi_1 = \partial_m \phi_0$ and $\phi_2 = \partial_m^2 \phi_0$. The scalar overlap q will now be generalized by introducing the overlap matrix $q_{ab} = m^a \cdot m^b$. This form of the action is different from the one in [7, 9], where the delta function enforcing the TAP equations was used to eliminate the factor $J_{ij} m_i^a m_j^a$ in (10). This is a crucial point: this method explicitly *breaks* the BRST invariance of the action, which is the crucial tool to establish the exact connection with the static free energy. We therefore do not use this method, and keep the whole BRST invariant action [19].

In order to linearize the quadratic terms we introduce the usual Lagrange multipliers, $m^a m^b \to \lambda_{ab}$, $m^a x^b \to w_{ab}$, $\bar{\psi}^a \psi^b \to t_{ab}$ [18]. After this is done, the integrals in x and $\bar{\psi}, \psi$ become Gaussian and can be performed explicitly. Moreover, the action factorizes and for $N \to \infty$ we can use the steepest descent method, to get,

$$-\beta r\, \Psi(\beta, r) = \lim_{n\to 0} \frac{1}{n}\left[\Sigma_0 + \log \int \prod_a dm^a e^{\mathcal{L}(m^a)}\right] \ . \tag{12}$$

Following [5, 7, 18] we define,

$$B_{ab} \ \equiv \ \beta^2 (1 - q_{aa})\, \delta_{ab} + t^{ab} \tag{13}$$

$$\Delta_{ab} \ \equiv \ -\beta^2 (1 - q_{aa})\, \delta_{ab} - w^{ab} \ , \tag{14}$$

and therefore obtain (details will be given elsewhere),

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_0 =& \ \frac{1}{2\beta^2}\sum_{ab}(B_{ab}^2 - \Delta_{ab}^2) - \sum_a (B_{aa} + \Delta_{aa})(1 - q_{aa}) \\ & - \sum_{ab}\left[\frac{\beta^2}{4} r^2\, q_{ab}^2 + \lambda^{ab} q_{ab} - r\Delta^{ab} q_{ab}\right] - \frac{1}{2}\log[(2\pi\beta^2)^n \det q_{ab}] \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(m^a) =& -r\sum_a \phi_0(q_{aa}, m^a) + \sum_{ab}\lambda^{ab} m^a m^b + \log\det\left(\frac{\delta_{ab}}{1 - m_a^2} + B_{ab}\right) \\ & - \frac{1}{2\beta^2}\sum_{ab}\left[\tanh^{-1} m^a - \sum_c \Delta^{ac} m^c\right] q_{ab}^{-1}\left[\tanh^{-1} m^b - \sum_c \Delta^{bc} m^c\right] \ . \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The parameters $\Delta_{ab}, B_{ab}, \lambda_{ab}$ and q_{ab} must be fixed by the saddle point equations, and it is easy to show that $B_{ab} = 0$ is solution. It is important at this point to consider the role of the supersymmetry. In [4] it was noted that action (10) is invariant under a generalization of the BRST supersymmetry [2, 3],

$$\delta m_i = \epsilon\, \psi_i \qquad \delta x_i = \epsilon\, r\, \psi_i \qquad \delta\bar{\psi}_i = -\epsilon\, x_i \qquad \delta\psi_i = 0 \ .$$

where ϵ is an infinitesimal Grassmann parameter. If we calculate the variation of $m_i\bar{\psi}_i$ and $x_i\bar{\psi}_i$ [4, 18], we obtain the two BRST equations,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\bar{\psi}_i\psi_i\rangle \ &+\ \langle m_i x_i\rangle = 0 & (17)\\ r\,\langle\bar{\psi}_i\psi_i\rangle \ &+\ \langle x_i x_i\rangle = 0 \ \ . & (18)\end{aligned}$$

After some algebra, these equations become,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{ab} &= \beta^2 q_{ab}\, r & (19)\\ \lambda_{ab} &= \frac{1}{2}\,\beta^2 r^2\, q_{ab}\ , & (20)\end{aligned}$$

and it is possible to show that the remaining saddle point equations are indeed satisfied by (19) and (20). The only saddle point equation we are left with is obtained by doing the variations of (15) and (16) with respect to λ_{ab}. This gives,

$$q_{ab} = \langle\langle m^a m^b\rangle\rangle\ , \tag{21}$$

where the average is performed with the distribution $\exp(\mathcal{L}(m^a))$. If we use equations (19), (20) and (21) into (15) and (16), and make the change of variable $m^a \to h^a = \tanh^{-1}(m^a)$, we finally obtain,

$$\beta\Psi(\beta,r) = -\log 2 + \frac{\beta^2}{4n}\left[r\sum_{ab}^{n} q_{ab}^2 - \sum_{a}^{n}(1-q_{aa})^2\right] - \frac{1}{nr}\log\int\prod_a^n \frac{dh^a}{\sqrt{2\pi\beta^2\det q_{ab}}}\ \ \cosh(h^a)^r\ e^{-\frac{1}{2\beta^2}\sum_{ab}^n h^a q_{ab}^{-1} h^b}\ . \tag{22}$$

Expression (22) is different from the one of [7, 9]: the BRST supersymmetry automatically selects one saddle point in the space of parameters, and in so doing it drastically reduces the number of parameters, compared to [7, 9]. The computation of $\Psi(\beta,r)$ has at this point the same degree of difficulty as the one of the standard free energy $F(\beta)$, with just one overlap matrix q_{ab} to be fixed variationally. We shall now show that the connections between $\Psi(\beta,r)$ and $F(\beta)$ are in fact much deeper than that.

The general form of the quenched free energy in the SK model is [14],

$$\beta F(\beta) = -\frac{\beta^2}{4} + \frac{\beta^2}{2n_s}\sum_{\alpha>\beta}^{n_s} Q_{\alpha\beta}^2 - \frac{1}{n_s}\log\sum_{[\sigma^\alpha]}\exp\left[\frac{\beta^2}{2}\sum_{\alpha\neq\beta}^{n_s} Q_{\alpha\beta}\,\sigma^\alpha\sigma^\beta\right]\ , \tag{23}$$

where $Q_{\alpha\beta}$ is the $n_s \times n_s$ overlap matrix, with $n_s \to 0$. If in (22) we use the relation,

$$\cosh(h_a)^r = \frac{1}{2^r}\sum_{[\tau_a^\mu=\pm 1]} e^{h_a\sum_\mu^r \tau_a^\mu}\ , \tag{24}$$

we obtain,

$$\beta\Psi(\beta,r) = -\frac{\beta^2}{4} + \frac{\beta^2}{2n}\left[r\sum_{a>b}^{n} q_{ab}^2 + \frac{r-1}{2}\sum_{a}^{n} q_{aa}^2\right] - \frac{1}{nr}\log\sum_{[\tau_a^\mu]}\exp\left[\frac{\beta^2}{2}\left(\sum_{ab}^{n}\sum_{\mu\nu}^{r}\tau_a^\mu q_{ab}\tau_b^\nu - \sum_{a}^{n}\sum_{\mu}^{r} q_{aa}\right)\right]\ . \tag{25}$$

The trace terms in equations (23) and (25) suggest the relation $n_s = r\cdot n$. Once this identification is done, we can connect the σ^α spin variables ($\alpha = 1,\ldots,n_s$), to the τ_a^μ spin variables ($a = 1,\ldots,n;\ \mu = 1,\ldots,r$) in the following way,

$$(\sigma_1,\ldots,\sigma_{n_s}) = \left(\tau_1^1,\ldots,\tau_1^r,\ \ldots\ldots,\tau_n^1,\ldots,\tau_n^r\right)\ .$$

Let us now assume that the potential $\Psi(\beta,r)$ (and thus the TAP complexity) is calculated at k levels of replica symmetry breaking (RSB) [17]. The TAP overlap matrix q_{ab} is then given by,

$$q_{ab}^{(k)} = q_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{k+1}(q_i - q_{i-1})\ \varepsilon_{ab}^{(n,y_i)}\ , \tag{26}$$

with $y_{k+1} = 1$ and $\varepsilon_{ab}^{(n,1)} = \delta_{ab}$. The matrices $\varepsilon^{(n,y_i)}$ are $n \times n$ ultrametric block matrices, equal to one on the diagonal blocks of size y_i, and zero elsewhere. The variables y_i are thus the replica symmetry breaking points. In the TAP approach the diagonal of the overlap matrix, $q_{aa} = q_{k+1}$, contains the self-overlap of the states, and for this reason $y_{k+1} = 1$. There are $k+1$ values of the overlap, but only k nontrivial breaking points, and thus q_{ab} is a k-RSB matrix. Given this form of q_{ab}, it is possible to prove (details will be given elsewhere) that,

$$\sum_{ab}^{n}\sum_{\mu\nu}^{r} \tau_a^{\mu} q_{ab}^{(k)} \tau_b^{\nu} - \sum_{a}^{n}\sum_{\mu}^{r} q_{aa}^{(k)} \;=\; \sum_{\alpha\neq\beta}^{rn} Q_{\alpha\beta}^{(k+1)}\, \sigma_\alpha \sigma_\beta \ , \tag{27}$$

where $Q_{\alpha\beta}^{(k+1)}$ is a standard $rn \times rn$ RSB matrix, with $k+1$ levels of replica symmetry breaking. More precisely,

$$Q_{\alpha\beta}^{(k+1)} = q_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} (q_i - q_{i-1})\; \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(rn, r y_i)} \ . \tag{28}$$

From this formula we see that the entries of $Q_{\alpha\beta}^{(k+1)}$ are the same as $q_{ab}^{(k)}$, whereas the $k+1$ replica symmetry breaking points x_i of $Q_{\alpha\beta}^{(k+1)}$ are rescaled by a factor r, that is $x_i = r\, y_i$. In particular, the *largest* breaking point $x \equiv x_{k+1}$ of the static matrix $Q_{\alpha\beta}^{(k+1)}$ is given by,

$$x = r \ . \tag{29}$$

By inserting relation (27) into (25), we finally obtain,

$$\Psi(\beta, r\, | q_{ab}^{(k)}) = F(\beta |\, Q_{ab}^{(k+1)}) \ , \tag{30}$$

We have thus proved that the thermodynamic potential $\Psi(\beta, r)$ calculated at the k RSB level is equal to static free energy $F(\beta)$ calculated at the $k+1$ RSB level. The replica symmetry breaking points of the static matrix $Q_{\alpha\beta}$ are simply the ones of the TAP matrix q_{ab} rescaled by the parameter r, and the extra $k+1$-th breaking point of $Q_{\alpha\beta}$ is equal to r. This rescaling was first noted in [9], and later in [12], although the lack of BRST symmetry of those calculations prevented to prove equation (30).

From equation (3), and given the relation between $\Psi(\beta, r)$ and $F(\beta)$, we finally have the general Legendre equation connecting the quenched complexity of the TAP states to the standard static free energy in the SK model,

$$\Sigma(\beta, f) = \beta x f - \beta x F(\beta; x) \ , \tag{31}$$

with the largest breaking point x fixed by the equation,

$$f = F(\beta; x) + x\, \frac{\partial F(\beta; x)}{\partial x} \ . \tag{32}$$

This result can be summarized as follows: *the supersymmetric quenched complexity of the TAP states is the Legendre transform of the static free energy with respect to the largest breaking point x of its overlap matrix.* This result allows to compute the exact quenched complexity in the SK model, that is the complexity at the *full*- RSB level, as the Legendre transform of the full-RSB static free energy [20].

It has been conjectured in [21] that in systems with more than one step of replica symmetry breaking the complexity of *clusters* at level i is given by the Legendre transform of the free energy with respect to the breaking point x_i. For $x_i = x_{max}$ clusters are just states, and our result is recovered. It would be interesting to study whether the conjecture of [21] can be exactly proved within the supersymmetric formalism used here.

We thank A. Crisanti, L. Leuzzi, R. Monasson, A. Montanari, F. Ricci-Tersenghi, and T. Rizzo for some interesting discussions.

---

[1] G. Adam and J.H. Gibbs, J. Chem. Phys. **43**, 139 (1965).
[2] Becchi C, Rouet A and Stora R 1974 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52B** 344.
[3] Tyutin I V 1975 *Lebedev preprint* FIAN 39, unpublished.
[4] Cavagna A, Garrahan J P and Giardina I 1998 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **32** 711.

[5] Bray A J and Moore M A 1980 *J. Phys. C: Solid. St. Phys* **13** L469.
[6] Bray A J and Moore M A 1980 *J. Phys. C: Solid. St. Phys* **13** L907.
[7] Bray A J and Moore M A 1980 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **14** L377.
[8] De Dominicis C and Young A P, 1983 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **16** 2063.
[9] Bray A J, Moore M A and Young A P, 1984 *J. Phys. C: Solid St. Phys* **17** L155.
[10] Monasson R 1995 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75** 2847.
[11] Franz S. and Parisi G. 1995 *J. Physique I* **3** 1819.
[12] Potters M and Parisi G 1995 *Europhys. Lett.* **32** 13.
[13] Crisanti A and Sommers H-J 1995 *J. Phys. I France* **5** 805
[14] Sherrington D and Kirkpatrick S 1975 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **32** 1792.
[15] Thouless D J, Anderson P W and Palmer R G 1977 *Phil. Mag.* **35** 593.
[16] Parisi G 1979 *Phys. Lett.* **73A** 203.
[17] Mézard M, Parisi G and Virasoro M.A., *Spin glass theory and beyond*, World Scientific (1987).
[18] Cavagna A, Giardina I, Parisi G and Mezard M 2003 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **36** 1175.
[19] Very recent results, however, seem to show that the supersymmetry can effectively be restored after a suitable reparametrization [20].
[20] A. Crisanti, L. Leuzzi, T. Rizzo, in preparation (2003).
[21] A. Montanari, F. Ricci-Tersenghi, preprint cond-mat/0301591 (2003).